



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,134	07/25/2005	Hironobu Moriyama	124798	4332

25944 7590 04/26/2007
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

HARRIS, GARY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/543,134

Applicant(s)

MORIYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Gary D. Harris

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 8-10 & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inagaki et al. US 6,696,197.

As to Claim 1, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses a liquid absorbing polymeric material formed into a sheet designed to absorb electrolyte (Col. 13, Line 62-67). Electrolytic absorbing sheets disclosed by Inagaki et al. '197 may contain monofunctioning monomers and polyfunctioning monomers (Col. 14, Line 1-18) from a secondary battery source (Col. 1, Line 27-30).

As to Claim 8, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses by example 22 that the liquid absorbing sheet prevented leakage to the circuit substrate section (Col. 24, Line 43-56).

As to Claim 9, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses an electrolyte absorbing sheet between heat conducting sheet and secondary battery unit (Col. 4, Line 52-64).

As to Claim 10, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses the use of lithium hexafluoro phosphate (Col. 10, Line 9-18) and flame retardant (Col. 13, Line 16-19).

As to Claim 13, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses a nonaqueous electrolyte battery pack comprising a battery cell, circuit board and battery case (Col. 13, Line 30-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. US 6,696,197 as applied to claim 1, 8-10 & 13 above.

As to Claim 2,3, Inagaki et al. '197 does not disclose solubility parameters. However, these properties are inherent because the applicants and the inventors teach virtually identical structures with similar materials. The physical properties of similar materials will inherently be similar. The burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to show the prior art properties are different from those claimed. See *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F. 2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

As to Claim 4, 5, 6, 7 & 12, Inagaki et al. '197 discloses the desirability of using a homopolymer and/or copolymer in the absorbing sheet (Col. 13, Line 62-67). Inagaki et al. '197 does not disclose UV-polymerization initiator per weight of monomer and irradiation with UV-rays. However the patentability of a product is independent of how it was made. Ex parte Jungfer 18 USPQ 1796, 1800 (BPAI 1991); Bristol-Myers Co. v. U.S. International Trade Commission 15 USPQ 2d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The burden is on applicants to show product differences in product by process claims. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See MPEP 2113.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. US 6,696,197 as applied to claim 1, 8-10 & 13 above, and further in view of Moritani et al US 4,929,482.

As to Claim 11, Inagaki et al. '197 does not disclose the use of bisphenol as a flame retardant or the flame retardant present in the monomer. However, Inagaki et al. '197 does disclose that the type of electrolyte absorbing sheet is not particularly limited (Col. 14, Line 19-20). However, Moritani et al. '482 discloses the addition of heat stabilizers including bisphenols (Col. 3, Line 1-25). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize bisphenols as taught by Moritani et al. '482 in the Inagaki et al. '197 invention as phenols are well known in the industry as heat stabilizers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary D. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-6508. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol D. Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GH


CAROL CHANEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER